Idaho Geospatial Committee: minutes

IGC Committee February 6, 2003

Call To Order

Background:

Notes

Jonathan Perry asks Bart to keep notes. Meeting called to Order at 1:03

Attendance

Background:

Notes

Present: Jonathan Perry, Nathan Bentley, Roger Hirschman, Karen LaMotte (State Library), Bart Butterfield, Tracy Fuller, Gail Ewart, Dennis Hill, Craig Rindlisbacher, Frank Roberts by phone, Mike Beaty, Frank Mynar, Dr. Nancy Glenn, Mike McDowell, Tony Morse

Absent: Dr. Charles Bolles, Senator Hal Bunderson

Others Present: Dave Gruenhagen, Janet Cheney, Nick Nyddegger

Approval of Minutes

Background:

Notes

September 18, 2002. Jonathan describes problem with getting minutes completed and posted. Last meetings minutes not complete, therefore cannot approve.

Nathan - discussions ongoing with AG regarding requirements for notes. No requirement indicated. IGC will try to keep notes during meeting. Craig - difficult to move forward on issues without minutes. ITRMC gets info from IGC via regular updates from Chairman. Craig - we should communicate to ITRMC that this is a problem. Meetings are also being audio-taped. Jonathan asks for suggestions on how to communicate to ITRMC. IGC does not set policy, but provides recommendations to ITRMC that does set policy. IGC needs someone to take minutes. A member is unable to effectively engage in the meeting and take minutes.

Response to no minutes

Background: Response to failure of ITRMC to provide minutes?

Notes

Craig moves that the IGC chair write a letter to ITRMC stating that their responsibility to provide support to IGC not be neglected. Roger seconds. Motion passes with one abstention.

Reports: INSIDE Idaho

Background: Written Report from Lily Wai

Notes

Written report provided to all attendees. Nathan reports that steering Committee met for the first time. Lily recommend membership for a cross section of policy makes. Lily and Liza developed membership list. Draft business plan, MOU and discussed letter to President of UI. AG says OK to sign. Usage of INSIDE Idaho increasing.

Reports: I-Plan

Background: Nathan Bentley

Notes

Nathan reports on I-Plan workshop. It was productive and has received positive feedback. Meeting minutes taken offline because of statements in brainstorming sessions. Available in PDF from Nathan. TWGs working on their plans. Craig asked if their was a time-frame for development of plans. Draft's due to Nathan by March 15 so that he can compile before Intermountain GIS Conference. Draft to be presented at conference. Conference scheduled Wednesday afternoon of the conference for I-Teams.

Reports: Committees

Background: Committee Chairs

Notes

Gail - transportation TWG passed first draft for I-Plan. In 2 weeks should have draft to Nathan. Dennis - Local Govt. Working towards 1) funding source for parcel mapping. Options 1. do nothing, 2 something attached to a fee, or 3. tap into E911. Base letter still in place for data structure. Need to develop policies regarding data needs, committee to oversee, before attempting legislation. Have been working with local politicians and lobbyists. Plan on having something available at Intermountain. Discussion of possible fee structure. Considering per doc fee on land related transactions. Mike asked about easements - no consideration of it yet but will probably be up in the future.

Policy 1070

Background: Nathan Bentley

Notes

Nathan - ITRMC recommended that the role of GIS Coordinator be more broadly defined. Also we are trying to move language from executive order into state policy. Tony - should there be a statement of purpose? Nathan will add relationship between IGC and 1070. Frank - should policy be focused on IGC rather than GIS? Tony - role of GIS Coordinator should be included if this policy is broadly GIS. Dennis - no mention of coordinator in executive order. Nathan - Definition of description of GIS will help IT Managers understand GIS. Nathan will also work on adding a purpose section. In general, 1070 justifies the use of GIS. Nathan asks for more feedback, no action currently needed. Need to define 'enterprise model'. Tony - we should not link GIS as an integral part of infrastructure support. Nathan disagrees, says it should be linked to IT. Craig suggests we are stumbling over semantics. Suggests a broader definition of IT. Tracy suggests a committee to help Nathan draft 1070, instead of trying to deal with it quarterly. Nick suggests changing wording to include IT, but to refine the description of GIS. Tony - GIS is actually an integral part of each organization, stretching beyond IT. Can't centralize a process that is an integral part of each organization and therefore cannot be centralized or lumped into IT. Suggestion to remove statement on integral part of IT and rework definition of GIS to encompass more. Gail, Tony and Nick volunteered to help Nathan. Not a new committee for IGC.

Reports: Digital Gov't Day

Background:

Notes

Jonathan reported on Digital Gov't Day. Nathan thanked for web links for use with legislators. He used them to describe GIS to E-Government committee.

NSDI Support

Background: We have been requested to give support to a document.

Notes

Nathan - document developed and sent out by NSGIC and sent to local councils. States the GIS data is infrastructure and should be supported as infrastructure. Identifies significant layers. Going to Congress next Monday. We must sign by tomorrow if we want to state our support. Jonathan - this document is basically a recommendation, it doesn't actually establish anything. It expresses interest in GIS data as infrastructure, funding and sharing. Clarification by Mike, NSDI is an executive order by Clinton. This document calls for going beyond and have congress establish it in code. Discussion on whether to support it. Craig says this document isn't specific. Tony asks what does it impede? No one sees any harm.

Roger moves to give chair authority to sign document, Gail seconds motion. Passes.

Projection Standard for Idaho

Background: Standards Committee

Notes

Jonathan - IGC recommends policy and has a big voice. He is concerned that we should have a semblance of process. Standards committee, Nathan, presents 4210, draft proposed projection standard. Projection working group developed the proposed standard. Current draft from working group. It was forwarded. Standards committee has not met to discuss or act on it. Nathan bringing it to IGC for us to act on it anyway. Bart expressed concern about process and records leading up to this, Dennis states recognition that projection needs are different amount different sized agencies. Nick two basic projections, UTM and geographic. He uses UTM for local needs, switches to geographic for larger applications. IDTM was a brilliant idea, but implementation flawed. Now we are building on those flaws. Should be simplified, rather than made more complex, i.e.. Use standard UTM parameters. If we aren't going to make a major change, then leave parameters as they are. If we are going to make a major change, then go back to UTM parameters. Concern with keeping IDTM for communication with other states. Dave Gruenhagen - Jensen made current proposal. IDL has argued that justification was flawed. IDL, ITD, USGS Water Resources all store data in IDTM NAD83 with current parameters. Nick easier ways to document data and on the fly conversion. This approach is backwards, suggests storing data in UTM. Dennis - local data is typically stored in State Plane. Jonathan - options 1) IGC vote on current proposal, 2) send back to standards committee, 3) modify proposal, 4) ITRMC will adopt something, probably current proposal. Dennis moves to send back to working committee. Would like a report from the working committee. Mike Beaty, Donna Fornshell, Michael Ciscell, Tim Williams, others. That group was an "ad-hoc" meeting advertised over the geo-list serve so was open to anyone who attended. Not a formal committee. Whoever showed up. Standards committee given opportunity to work on it, but unable to. Mike would like group to evaluate offset adjustments in MrSID files developed at IDWR. If an agency has already moved to NAD83, then it only requires a coordinate shift. Dave asks what is the need for changing the offsets. Mike - one reason for new shifts is to clearly distinguish IDTM27 from IDTM83 in display. Dennis restates his motion to send it back to Standards Committee. Tony, Nathan, Bob Smith, Danielle Bruno, Roger Kassens, Steve Garcia are on the standards committee. Tracy asks to modify motion to require report from committee. Motion now stands as "send back to the Standards Committee to develop recommendation, specifically the false eastings and northings and report back to the IGC with explanation for parameters to report back to IGC at next meeting". Second by Roger. Dennis says he would also be comfortable with IGC voting on it right now if others agree. Passes 8 to 5, with on abstention. Standard returns to Standards Committee.

Proposal for Procedures

Background: Should we amend by-laws or otherwise create formal rules for submitting proposals and standards?

Notes

State of New York standards process distributed. Jonathan asks if we want to develop a more defined process. Tony asks scope of the process, projections, data, what else? Could include all these. Do we need to more thoroughly define our process. Tracy says we have seen a number of approaches that some have failed and with no consistent approach. Bart says we need some sort of record. Gail asks if this is something for the standards committee. Jonathan will bring a proposal to the next IGC meeting. Mike contributes Washington State's standards process.

Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee

Background: Preliminary Recommendation 13 - Create a common service center and framework data repository supporting agencies efforts in using GIS

Notes

Establish a Department or Division of Information Services. Nathan - R13 is a discussion point inside the GOS. Lily and Liza expressed concern and forwarded this to the IGC. GOS met yesterday. They discussed this as a business model for state government. Not enough information to make a decision. Perhaps a needs assessment is needed. Their next meeting is March. Public safety, transportation, and natural resources has similarly preliminary recommendation for a GIS data standard. Both are still discussion points. Any further questions can be directed to Nathan. ITRMC says no decision has been made and it is pretty low priority. Tony - it is appropriate for IGC to provide a statement. Nathan says more appropriate later after if GOS passes it onto entire Blue Ribbon Task Force. Nathan clarifies that R13 was an individuals opinion, not an agency proposal. What is the feeling of local govt on these ideas. Craig says it could have impacts on local gov'ts. Dennis thinks we should make comment on it. Craig - same debate going on in local govt. Nick - it is a pretty universal discussion. How does IGC comment on it? Jonathan - somebody needs to prepare a statement for IGC to consider. Nathan will forward the preliminary recommendations out to all IGC members. Craig - some competing issues, we all recognize need for distributed GIS tools, but there are also things that are unique to GIS. Tony volunteers to head it up. Bart volunteers to help. Nancy offers to help. Also Craig.

Direction for IGC

Background: Jonathan Perry

Notes

Jonathan makes a presentation to develop a vision for IGC.

Nancy says we should be bringing input from each of our agencies.

Next Meeting Date

Background: Proposal: May 22, 2003 1:00 pm

Notes

Nathan - next ITRMC meeting is April. If we wait it will be put off till June. Dennis asked to wait until after Intermountain. Question about changing start time to 10:00 am. Move to May 15? Or May 29? May 8? Agreed on May 8, 2003. 10:00 am - 2:00 pm. Location to be determined.

Adjourn

Background: 4:30

Notes

Jonathan adjourns meeting. 3:45

Friday, February 07, 2003